



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/902,184

07/10/2001

Robert Craig Murphy

07099.1529

7537

826

7590

06/02/2004

ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA  
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

17

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/902,184

**Applicant(s)**

MURPHY ET AL.

**Examiner**

Anh Ly

**Art Unit**

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>#10 &amp; #11</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' Amendment filed on 04/12/2004.
2. Claims 19-26 have been added.
3. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statements filed 07/25/2002, Paper #8 has not been considered because Examiner did not receive PTO-1449, Applicant is hereby required to submit PTO-1449 in response to this Office Action Paper #17.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The term of "CDNA system" is not clearly described in the specification. Examiner would be interpreted as any system.

***Specification***

The abbreviation of CDNA, MDNA, CDNA ID, master DNA (MDNA) index and customer DNA (CDNA) number are in the specification should be described and spelled out clearly, Examiner would be interpreted those abbreviation as an index or any number.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,826,257 issued to Snelling, Jr. (hereinafter Snelling) in view of US Patent No. 6,029,174 issued to Sprenger et al. (hereinafter Sprenger).

With respect to claim 1, Snelling teaches receiving identifying information on a customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer (in the order processing application database as shown in fig. 6, Customer ID in customer table is an identifying information of a customer storing in the customer table; see fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 12-28);

determining whether an identifier exists in a master data store for the customer based on the received identifying information (Customer ID is primary key) and order table (Customer ID is foreign key), is a master including order table, customer table and employee table: col. 5, lines 12-67);

assigning an identifier based on a result of the determination (the order processing database from which Customer ID being stored in customer table (Customer ID, unique identification number, is assigned to be a primary for this order processing system and given the result of the determination: col. 6, lines 18-67).

Snelling teaches a database system as a master data store including a plurality of database tables such as shown in fig. 6, in both table Customer table having Customer ID as a primary key and Orders table having Customer ID as a foreign key. Also Snelling teaches Customer ID is a cross-referencing assigned identifier in the relationship between Customer table (primary key) and Order table (foreign key): col. 5, lines 12-28 and see fig. 6). Snelling does not explicitly teach cross-referencing the

Art Unit: 2172

assigned identifier with the received identifying information and an indication of the electronic storage facility containing the customer information.

However, Sprenger teaches identifier is to be used as a cross-referencing identifier to get back or pointer to the right database in the multiple databases and multiple machine system (col. 20, lines 38-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snelling with the teachings of Sprenger so as to have an identifier to be cross-referenced to the right database. The motivation being to have a cross-referencing identifier for being easily to get back to the right database in a complex database management system including a plurality of databases and multiple machines to be accessible over the computer network.

With respect to claim 2, Snelling teaches retrieving identifying information from the master data store based on an identifier (see fig. 19, customer order database is established or displayed is based on the relationship of customer Id in the customer table and order table of the order processing system: see fig. 14, lines 42-67).

With respect to claim 3, Snelling teaches wherein identifying information includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility transmitting identifying information, a customer identifier for identifying customer information in the electronic storage facility; and customer data for matching a customer with existing customers in the master data store (customer ID stored in customer database is an identifying information of the customer table, which is one of table or database in the order processing system and it is used to access or process the order database to get

Art Unit: 2172

customer order information as shown in fig. 19: col. 5, lines 12-67 and col. 14, lines 42-67).

With respect to claim 4, Snelling teaches wherein customer data includes a customer's name and address (in customer table shown in fig. 6, customer address and customer company name: col. 5, lines 12-28).

With respect to claim 5, Snelling teaches wherein determining comprises: comparing the standardized identifying information to existing data in the master data store (see figs. 4 and 5, lookup the column value in customer table and order table: col. 5, lines 58-67, col. 6, lines 1-4, col. 9, lines 52-67, col. 10, lines 1-48 and col. 14, lines 42-67).

With respect to claim 6, Snelling teaches creating a record in a table having a first and second field wherein the first field stores the assigned identifier and the second field stores the identifying information (the customer in the customer table and order table is an cross-referencing identification information between two tables: primary key and foreign key of the Customer ID in customer table and order table respectively: col. 5, lines 12-67 and col. 1, lines 32-45).

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.



Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 19, Snelling teaches a CDNA system for receiving customer information from an electronic storage facility, said CDNA system comprising a master data store and being capable of determining whether an identifier exists in the master data store for the customer based on the customer information identifying the customer, said CDNA system further capable of associating an identifier with the customer based on a result of the determination (in the order processing application database as shown in fig. 6, Customer ID in customer table is an identifying information of a customer storing in the customer table; see fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 12-28; the order processing database from which Customer ID being stored in customer table (Customer ID is primary key) and order table (Customer ID is foreign key), is a master including order table, customer table and employee table: col. 5, lines 12-67; Customer ID, unique identification number, is assigned to be a primary for this order processing system and given the result of the determination: col. 6, lines 18-67).

Art Unit: 2172

Snelling teaches a database system as a master data store including a plurality of database tables such as shown in fig. 6, in both table Customer table having Customer ID as a primary key and Orders table having Customer ID as a foreign key. Also Snelling teaches Customer ID is a cross-referencing assigned identifier in the relationship between Customer table (primary key) and Order table (foreign key): col. 5, lines 12-28 and see fig. 6). Snelling does not explicitly teach a plurality of electronic storage facilities for storing customer information associated with and identifying a customer; and cross-referencing the identifier with the customer information within the master data store.

However, Sprenger teaches identifier is to be used as a cross-referencing identifier to get back or pointer to the right database in the multiple databases and multiple machine system (col. 20, lines 38-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snelling with the teachings of Sprenger so as to have an identifier to be cross-referenced to the right database. The motivation being to have a cross-referencing identifier for being easily to get back to the right database in a complex database management system including a plurality of databases and multiple machine to be accessible over the computer network.

With respect to claim 20, Snelling teaches wherein said CDNA system is further configured to: retrieve customer information from the master data store based on the identifier (see fig. 19, customer order database is established or displayed is based on

Art Unit: 2172

the relationship of customer Id in the customer table and order table of the order processing system: see fig. 14, lines 42-67).

With respect to claim 21, Snelling teaches wherein the customer information includes a storage identifier to identify said respective electronic storage facility transmitting the travel-based information, a customer identifier for identifying customer information in said electronic storage facility; and customer data for matching a customer with existing customers in the master data store (customer ID stored in customer database is an identifying information of the customer table, which is one of table or database in the order processing system and it is used to access or process the order database to get customer order information as shown in fig. 19: col. 5, lines 12-67 and col. 14, lines 42-67).

With respect to claim 22, Snelling teaches wherein said CDNA system cross-references the identifier with the customer information by creating a record in a table within the master data store having first and second fields, wherein the first field stores the identifier and the second field stores the customer information (the customer in the customer table and order table is an cross-referencing identification information between two tables: primary key and foreign key of the Customer ID in customer table and order table respectively: col. 5, lines 12-67 and col. 1, lines 32-45).

With respect to claim 23, Snelling teaches a CDNA system in communication with said electronic storage facilities, wherein said CDNA system comprises a master data store comprising for each customer a unique identifier identifying the customer and a list of the electronic facilities that contain information for the customer along with the

Art Unit: 2172

identification for the customer used by each electronic storage facility (in the order processing application database as shown in fig. 6, Customer ID in customer table is an identifying information of a customer storing in the customer table; see fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 12-28; the order processing database from which Customer ID being stored in customer table (Customer ID is primary key) and order table (Customer ID is foreign key), is a master including order table, customer table and employee table: col. 5, lines 12-67).

Snelling teaches a database system as a master data store including a plurality of database tables such as shown in fig. 6, in both table Customer table having Customer ID as a primary key and Orders table having Customer ID as a foreign key. Also Snelling teaches Customer ID is a cross-referencing assigned identifier in the relationship between Customer table (primary key) and Order table (foreign key): col. 5, lines 12-28 and see fig. 6). Snelling does not explicitly teach a plurality of electronic storage facilities for storing customer information associated with and identifying a customer, wherein each electronic storage facility uses a different identifier to identify the customer information.

However, Sprenger teaches identifier is to be used as a cross-referencing identifier to get back or pointer to the right database in the multiple databases and multiple machine system (col. 20, lines 38-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snelling with the teachings of Sprenger so as to have an identifier to be cross-referenced to the right database. The

motivation being to have a cross-referencing identifier for being easily to get back to the right database in a complex database management system including a plurality of databases and multiple machine to be accessible over the computer network.

With respect to claim 24, Snelling teaches wherein when said CDNA system receives an inquiry for information associated with a customer, said CDNA system provides information indicating which electronic storage facilities contain information related to the customer and the identification used by each electronic facility to identify the customer's information (see fig. 19, customer order database is established or displayed is based on the relationship of customer Id in the customer table and order table of the order processing system: see fig. 14, lines 42-67).

With respect to claim 25, Snelling teaches storing in a master data store for each customer a unique identifier identifying the customer and a list of the electronic facilities that contain information for the customer along with the identification for the customer used by each electronic storage facility (in the order processing application database as shown in fig. 6, Customer ID in customer table is an identifying information of a customer storing in the customer table; see fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 12-28; the order processing database from which Customer ID being stored in customer table (Customer ID is primary key) and order table (Customer ID is foreign key), is a master including order table, customer table and employee table: col. 5, lines 12-67).

Snelling teaches a database system as a master data store including a plurality of database tables such as shown in fig. 6, in both table Customer table having Customer ID as a primary key and Orders table having Customer ID as a foreign key.

Also Snelling teaches Customer ID is a cross-referencing assigned identifier in the relationship between Customer table (primary key) and Order table (foreign key): col. 5, lines 12-28 and see fig. 6). Snelling does not explicitly teach providing a plurality of electronic storage facilities, wherein each storage facility contains information concerning a customer and uses a different identifier to identify the customer information from that of the other electronic storage facilities.

However, Sprenger teaches identifier is to be used as a cross-referencing identifier to get back or pointer to the right database in the multiple databases and multiple machine system (col. 20, lines 38-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Snelling with the teachings of Sprenger so as to have an identifier to be cross-referenced to the right database. The motivation being to have a cross-referencing identifier for being easily to get back to the right database in a complex database management system including a plurality of databases and multiple machine to be accessible over the computer network.

With respect to claim 26, Snelling teaches receiving an inquiry for information associated with a customer; accessing the master data store; and providing information indicating which electronic storage facilities contain information related to the customer and the identification used by each electronic facility to identify the customer's information (in the order processing application database as shown in fig. 6, Customer ID in customer table is an identifying information of a customer storing in the customer table; see fig. 6 and col. 5, lines 12-28; the order processing database from which

Art Unit: 2172

Customer ID being stored in customer table (Customer ID is primary key) and order table (Customer ID is foreign key), is a master including order table, customer table and employee table: col. 5, lines 12-67).

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**Contact Information**

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (703) 306-4527 via E-Mail: **ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV**. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, see the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks


Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

ANH LY   
May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2004

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER